

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4 and 7 are independent. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 6 and 7 have been added. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification as originally filed, specifically at pages 52-64. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,835,144 to Matsumura, et al.

Independent claim 1 now recites, in part, as follows:

“...start detecting means for detecting the start of the predetermined unit of the input data, in which the predetermined unit corresponds to a frame;

means for receiving a frame end signal indicative of the end of a number of frames;

end detecting means for detecting the end of a respective frame based on the frame end signal...”
(emphasis added)

Applicants submit that the portions of Matsumura et al. apparently relied on by the examiner in the Office Action (hereinafter, merely “Matsumura”) do not disclose the above-

identified feature of claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Matsumura.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to claim 1, independent claim 4 is believed to be distinguishable from Matsumura.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Matsumura in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,494 to Strongin, et al.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 depend from one of amended independent claims 1 or 4, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable Matsumura for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have used Strongin to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Matsumura, and therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, and 5 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Matsumura and Strongin.


Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800